

**REMARKS**

In the Advisory Action of October 12, 2005, the Examiner did not indicate whether the minor amendment to the claims would be entered or not. It is requested that the Amendment After Final should not be entered.

Claims 22-35 are pending.

Claims 22, 29, 33, 34 and 35 are independent claims.

**Explanation of New Claims**

1. As to independent Claim 22:

Regarding the electronic advertisement receiving apparatus for a user, the presentation state managing means manages the state of presentation in which advertisement information of an electronic advertisement received by the user through the first communication means is presented to the user. The advertiser is informed of the managed state of presentation, and the user can obtain any benefits according to the managed state of presentation.

2. As to independent Claim 29:

Regarding the electronic advertisement confirming apparatus for an advertiser, an electronic advertisement is supplied to the external device of a user through the first communication means, and then advertisement information of the supplied electronic advertisement is presented through the external device to the user. The electronic advertisement confirming apparatus receives from the external device the state of presentation in which the

advertisement information of the electronic advertisement is presented to the user, and confirms the validity of the received state of presentation.

Please note that independent claims 34 and 35 are method claims corresponding respectively to claims 22 and 29, and independent claim 12 is directed to a system corresponding to claims 22 and 29. Accordingly, in arguing that independent claims 12 to 14 are also distinguished over the previous references, applied as described above concerning claims 22 and 29.

With respect to independent claims 34 and 35, these are method claims corresponding to claims 22 and 29 (explained above) respectively.

With respect to independent claim 12, this is directed to a system corresponding to the features in Claims 22 and 29.

#### **Reply to Rejections**

In the Final Office Action, claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldhaber (U. S. Patent 5,794,210) in view of Reilly (U. S. Patent 5,740,549).

As explained above, new independent claims, claim features not shown or suggested by Goldhaber in view of Reilly.

Also, in the final rejection, some claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goldhaber in view of Reilly (U. S. Patent 5,740,549), in view of Steele (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,047) and in view of Rautila U.S. Patent No. 6,524,189.

As explained above, the first two references do not show or suggest the features now claimed in the independent claim. The addition of Rautila and Steele do not show or suggest the features in the context claimed of the independent claims now presented as explained above.

With respect to the dependent claims, now presented, these claims are considered patentable at least for the same reasons as their base or intervening claims.


### CONCLUSION

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Elliot A. Goldberg (Reg. No. 33,347) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Terrell C. Birch  
Registration No.: 19,382  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road  
Suite 100 East  
P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000  
Attorney for Applicant